

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/539,134 | 06/16/2005 | Alfred Oftring | 273245US0PCT | 2282 | |
| | 7590 07/24/200 AK, MCCLELLAND | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | SACKEY, EBENEZER O | | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1624 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 07/24/2009 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/539,134 | OFTRING ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| EBENEZER SACKEY | 1624 | | |

| | EBENEZER SACKEY | 1624 | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 26 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | | | | | |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time The reply was the filed within one of the following time. The reply was the filed within one of the following time. | | | | | | | |
| periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i | | | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex variety 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL. | tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extel Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l They raise new issues that would require further contains the insurance of the contains the co | nsideration and/or search (see NOT | | cause | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | lucing or simplifying t | ne issues for | | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | | | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | |
| [A Dewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 20-26, 28 and 34-41. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome all rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | try is below or attach | ed. | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| /James O. Wilson/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624 | | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the obviousness rejection of record has not been overcome. Note the only different step in the claims is "filtration", which is a recovery step after the final product is made. However, such is not patentiable in view of In re Duetschmann, 114, USPO 556.